1	the FCC?
2	A The Federal Communications
3	Commission.
4	Q Go on.
5	A 1992. We had been trying to get
6	financing from a gentleman named Dean Manson,
7	who purported to have contacts with a program
8	we were trying to consummate, that involved
9	the purchase of the Hickory, North Carolina
10	MSA license, and all the rural service area
11	licenses around that MSA, and Mr. Manson
12	turned out to be a fraud guy, so we dropped
13	that, and Mr. Guhl had spent a tremendous
14	amount of time and effort with that.
15	Q "A fraud guy" meaning someone's
16	employed by the FBI, or some
17	A No. He was just a guy that was
18	Q Just a scarecrow.
19	A He was trying toyou know, you
20	pay advance fees and he's going to get you
21	debt financing. Of course he never does.
22	It's just a scam. So we dropped that and we

couldn't go forward on the purchase of the licenses. We had, you know, business plan, the whole nine yards, spent all the time and money on it.

So Guhl decided -- he looked really bad, he was afraid he's going to get fired. So he's trying to find some other financing. He goes back to have meetings and he runs, he goes -- runs back in with Gaubert. They try to aet involved us in а bankruptcy fraud situation where the elder Gaubert is selling off various assets including a radio station. I don't have any interest in that. dropped that.

That was in the early part of 1992. Later on, in 1992, Lonnie Guhl decides to go back and have some more meetings, and in July, we were approached by this guy whose name is Larry Long. He's a confidential informant and he wants to-this is the guy supposedly had the investment banking firm and thing from the year before.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 He reappears. Unbeknownst to me, 2 Guhl and Swanson start going and meeting with 3 him in Irving, Texas, and they 4 depositing cash in excess of \$10,000 a day. 5 They do it in two or three increments. 6 And where is this money coming 7 from? 8 Α Ιt comina from was the FBI. 9 Supposedly coming from was this guy's 10 investment banking business and they were 11 treating it like he was -- they were sort of 12 illegal proceeds, or something. And I don't 13 know because I wasn't involved in that. 14 But apparently what happened is 15 they deposited money, like \$5000 or \$6000 in 16 the morning, and \$6000 in the afternoon. Ιt 17 turned out they were caught right away. 18 FBI told them let--told the banks to, 19 know, to continue to allow them to do this. 20 and they did it on two occasions in late July 21 1992, two occasions in early August 1992.

I was--Guhl got me to go out to a

2	'92. It was all recorded. And the next three
3	days, I was out of town on business. And on
4	Friday, they convinced me to go back out there
5	and have a meeting, and that meeting resulted
6	in their trying to give me a briefcase with
7	cash. I turned them down.
8	They managed to
9	Q Why did you turn them down?
10	A Cause I had no interest in doing
11	anything like that.
12	Q What specifically was it they were
13	proposing to you?
14	A They were proposing to invest so
15	much money in a subsidiary of Express, or some
16	company that was going to be affiliated with
17	it, when they were supposedly going to provide
18	other monies.
19	But as it turns out, the
20	videotape, the part, the last five minutes,
21	getthey weren't destroyed, it's just you
22	can't see anything anymore, and the audio gets

meeting with these people on August the 10th,

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	to where you can't hear anything anymore.
2	Q And what would that have showed?
3	A That I turned them down. So based
4	on Mr. Guhl and Mr. Swanson, they end upthey
5	pleaded guilty apparently a few months later.
6	Q And what did they plead guilty to?
7	A A violation of the currency
8	transaction reporting requirements.
9	Conspiracy. They become Government
10	informants, and so the Government spends the
11	next year or two doing everything it can to
12	put Express out of business.
13	Q But you ultimately plead guilty,
14	is that correct?
15	A Yes, sir.
16	Q Why did you plead guilty?
17	A Well, I'd never been involved in a
18	criminal proceeding before and I didn't really
19	understand what, what I should/shouldn't have
20	been doing. I didn't hire the right attorney
21	early enough. Matter of fact, I never hired
22	the right attorney before the quilty plea. So

1	I was indicted May 14.
2	Q What specifically was your
3	indictment for?
4	A The indictment was for the
5	conspiracy toactually, the indictment itself
6	was money laundering. One was conspiracy to
7	engage in money laundering. The other was
8	actually they produced a check that they wrote
9	up after the fact and claimed I'd seen the
10	check and knew about the check.
11	Q So let me stop you there just for
12	a second. The monies that you were alleged to
13	have taken are the monies that you are
14	maintaining that these two individuals
L5	deposited in excess of \$10,000 a day, and did
16	you ever ultimately take control of those
L7	monies in any way?
L8	A No, sir. Didn't know about it.
19	Q All right. Well, go on. You were
20	explaining why you pled guilty.
21	A Yes, sir. I got indicted in May,
22	realized I had the wrong attorney, so I tried

to hire Neal Harwell in Nashville, Tennessee, which is where I'm from. But there wasn't enough time and the judge decided that I wasn't going to be permitted to waive my speedy--rights to a speedy trial. I wasn't allowed the time to get other counsel. I wasn't allowed to--actually, to have enough time to prepare for trial.

The trial was going to begin in July of 1994, no matter what. There was a postponement for two weeks because the Government had--Mr. Hinkle, who the Government prosecutor, had another trial he was finishing up, and July 17 or 18, I was going to go to trial and I was going to lose, and I was going to do about seven years in prison.

And at that point in my life, I had parents who were eighty-seven, -eight, - nine years old. I couldn't see, you know, being in prison when they died.

So we didn't have access to the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	evidence. We were going to have to subpoena.
2	The Government wasn't going to produce any
3	Q Why were you convinced at that
4	pcint you were beingwhy were you
5	A Because I was going to go to trial
6	with an unprepared lawyer and I didn't have
7	time to prepare. Actually, I had no time to
8	prepare. And it was very clear, I wasn't
9	going to have any kind a chance at this.
10	Q What was the evidence that the
11	Governmentthat you knew the Government was
12	going to put into evidence against you?
13	A In criminal defense terms, it's
14	basically called theno offensethe "lying
15	whore."
16	Q I'm sorry?
17	A "Lying whore witnesses." You get
18	a bunch a people who pled guilty, who actually
19	did something, then they especially lying
20	about me, and they intimidated some of the
21	other people that worked at Express, some of
22	the employees. So either I was going to do

plead quilty and do a year, or a year and a 1 2 half in prison, or I was going to lose and do 3 seven years and try to appeal. I didn't see 4 that I could do seven years. 5 And you believe they didn't have 6 any direct evidence of your accepting or 7 controlling this money? 8 Oh, they didn't have any evidence 9 all, actually. didn't make Ιt 10 difference. I was learning--I learned a 11 lesson real fast. 12 Q Okay. Now, there were some other 13 legal problems that you had around this same 14 time, is that correct? You had some problems 15 in state court? 16 Not at that time. No, sir. 17 other issue involving the SEC, and they were--18 they had an informal order of investigation in 19 '93, became a formal order in '94. 20 situation that we just went over was what I 21 paying attention to and what Ι was

devoting money to.

1	And the state situation occurred
2	years later. They decided thatactually, it
3	was just one person whoMr. Oman, who's a
4	state securityan employee in the Texas State
5	Securities Board, Joseph Oman, he decided that
6	I hadn't been punished enough, so he went to
7	the district attorney's office in Dallas,
8	Texas, and pounded and pounded and pounded
9	away, so they finally indicted me and Mrtwo
10	people that worked with me at the timeone
11	was Robert Machem, and the other one was Karen
12	Matuszewski.
13	Q Now this was what type hearing?
14	A This was late 1997.
15	Q And this was in relation to
16	activities at Express?
17	A Yes, sir.
18	Q What was that conviction for? Or
19	was it a conviction or a plea?
20	A A guilty plea. They claimed that
21	one of our SMR equity programs that was
22	involved securities fraud, and securities

1 fraud was omitting to disclose in the offering 2 documents, one, that various states had 3 instituted administrative proceedings, state 4 securities, State of Illinois. We had a state 5 administrative proceeding and the FBI was 6 investigating this. 7 And the charge was that you had 8 failed to inform these investors that you were 9 being investigated by the FBI and other --10 Α And the state security regulatory 11 authorities. Yes, sir. 12 0 Okay. And what was the outcome of 13 your guilty plea there? Let me ask you this. 14 Why did you plead guilty in that case? 15 Α Well, Texas has a very unusual 16 rule, and it says you can't challenge the 17 sufficiency of an indictment, that you can't 18 challenge the indictment, at all, prior to 19 going to trial. So we tried--I hired William 20 Ravkind as one attorney and Joe Held as 21 another. Joe Held's a securities attorney in

And we filed a motion to dismiss the

1	indictment for all kinds of legal reasons, and
2	the court couldn't grant the motion because
3	under Texas criminal procedure, you have to go
4	to trial and get a verdict, and then you can
5	challenge the verdict in terms of the
6	sufficiency of the indictment. So I was going
7	to have to go to trial first, and then go
8	through all that, and then raise thatI
9	didn't have the money, and I didn't have much
10	choice. I didn't think I had much choice at
11	the time. So I pled guilty, got four years
12	probation, and that's what happened.
13	Q Well, why did your defense focus
14	on the insufficiency of the indictment?
15	A Well
16	Q And not the charge?
17	A Basically, under Texas law, what
18	we were selling was probably not a security.
19	So you can't engage in securities fraud if you
20	don't have a underlying security in the first
21	place.

Excuse me just a second.

2

22

And I

_	see that you would have had at least that
2	defense. But did you have no other defenses
3	to the charge?
4	A Well, you can argue, in typical
5	securities fraud, defenses in terms of
6	materiality and so forth, but, you know, this
7	is Dallas, Texas. This is a jury of some
8	interesting human beings, and all they're
9	going to know is people lost money, I'm a bad
10	person, I had a prior criminal conviction, and
11	I didn't think I had much chance of
12	prevailing. The conviction rate in these
13	courts is about 95 or 98, 99 percent.
14	Q Well, you were aware you didn't
15	have to take the stand in the case?
L6	A That didn't sound very appealing
L7	to me.
L8	Q Not to take the stand?
L9	A No. I was going to have to get up
20	there and explain.
21	Q But to go to the substance of the
22	charge, and that is that you hadn't revealed

1	to investors that you were under investigation
2	by various organizations, did you have no
3	defense against that charge? Substantive?
4	A It wasn't disclosed.
5	Q What wasn't disclosed?
6	A The fact that the state of
7	Illinois had an administrative proceedingwe
8	did not believe that the proceedings were
9	actually valid. We thought we werewhat we
10	were doing was perfectly within the law and
11	within the rules.
12	Q Why didn't you attempt to defend
13	yourself on that basis?
14	A You know, you're looking at a
15	situation where, if I had more money, and I
16	didn't have a prior criminal conviction, I
17	probably would have.
18	Q Do you remember how many counts
19	were made against you in the state court
20	action?
21	A Seven.
22	Q Seven?

1	A Sev	en individuals out of five	
2	hundred had a	problem.	
3	Q I'm	going to give you a series of	
4	names and tell	me whether these individuals	
5	were among tho	se who had made complaints.	
6	A You	must think I have a fantastic	
7	memory.	memory.	
8	Q Wel	l, all you had to do is say you	
9	don't remember	. I told you that at the	
10	beginning.		
11	Rob	ert A. Nelson?	
12	A I w	ould not have a clue.	
13	Q Har	ry I. Toombs, Jr.?	
14	A Don	't know.	
15	Q Dore	othy L. Williams?	
16	A Don	't know.	
17	Q Jef:	frey D. HeLal?	
18	A Don	't have a clue.	
19	Q I'm	sorry. Donna D. HeLal. Oh,	
20	Donna B. HeLal	l. No. David L. Chou? Or	
21	"Chow"?		
22	A No.	Don't remember.	

Ţ	Q And John D. Malik?
2	A I remember the name but I don't
3	have any idea whether he's in that group or
4	nct.
5	Q And the people that ultimately
6	complained against you are people who would
7	have invested money with Express?
8	A They invested the money. They
9	invested money and they bought units in a
10	limited liability company called Dallas Mobile
11	Continental LLC.
12	Q And do you know what ultimately
13	happened to their investment? Or what
14	happened to
15	A They lost the money.
16	Q They lost the money, and they were
17	never able to recoup it, to your knowledge?
18	A I paid them about 30 percent of
19	their money back through making payments when
20	I was on probation.
21	Q In the federal charges, do you
22	remember how many counts were against you in

1	that
2	A It was a two count indictment, one
3	count guilty plea.
4	Q And what was thedo you remember
5	the count that was dropped?
6	A Well, they dropped the indictment
7	and there was a superseding, you know, guilty
8	plea, so
9	Q No. I mean in return foryou
10	pled guilty to just one count; is that
11	correct?
12	A The guilty plea was different
13	from, completely different from the
14	indictment.
15	Q You mean there was a count that
16	was not included in the indictment?
17	A Oh, yes.
18	Q We have been going for about an
19	hour. If you need a break, we're happy to
20	take one now. If you can keep going, we can
21	keep going.

No problem.

Α

1 Do you know--let me ask you this. 0 2 I guess we'll start from here. Did there come 3 a time when you became associated or involved 4 with Preferred Communications Systems, Inc.? 5 Α Yes. 6 And can you tell us when Q Okay. 7 and how you became involved with them. 8 Well--Α 9 0 And I understand this may be a 10 long story. 11 Α When released from Ι was 12 Leavenworth prison camp, one of the first 13 things I did, I started working with June 14 McNally and John McNally at June's house on 15 4011 Rosa Road in Dallas. I called up Paul 16 Conrad, who was a marketing representative for 17 Express. He lives in San Juan, Puerto Rico, 18 and I was inquiring as to the status of the 19 licensed corporations that we had formed and 20 that held licenses on the island. Most of 21 them had a license in San Juan, a license in

Patillas, which would have been relocated to

Ponce, and one at Mayaguez.

And subsequent to--there were ten licensed corporations originally, and five more were formed, and the five had various licenses. And I was inquiring as to the status of the licensed corporations and what was going on.

And Mr. Conrad informed me that there'd been a takeover, and he, his partner, whose name was Edward J. Nemeth, who was a broker in the Miramar marketing offices, associated with Express--Unique Communications Concepts, Sacramento, California. Mr. Nemeth had decided to appropriate the opportunity, if you will, and there was Telecellular, Inc., which was a company that was formed in December 1993, there were five directors, myself, Karen Matuszewski, Frank Owens, Paul Conrad and then Nemeth.

And in 1994, Mr. Nemeth and Mr. Conrad had gone out and signed up all the licensed corporations to various agreements.

1	Q Can you tell us what the company
2	was that you'd formed at that point.
3	A Telecellular, Inc.
4	Q That's Telecellular? Okay. Go
5	ahead. I'm sorry to interrupt.
6	Q December 1993. They went out and
7	signed up all the licensed corporations to a
8	joint venture called Telecellular, and as
9	directors of Telecellular, Inc., Mr. Conrad
10	and Mr. Nemath were directorswell, this is
11	about the time I was having my legal
12	difficulties.
13	Subsequent to that, Mr. Nemath
14	persuaded Mr. Conrad, and others, to create a
15	second company called Telecellular Puerto
16	Rico, Inc., which ended up beingthere was
17	one formed in Puerto Rico in September of
18	1994. They abandoned that company and formed
19	a Telecellular Puerto Rico in Delaware in
20	February 1995.
21	So we're going to have one set of
22	documents, and then we're going to ignore that

1	one set of documents and we're going to create
2	a second company that had a second set of
3	documents. We're just going to ignore the
4	first company and everything.
5	Q The first one being Telecellular
6	or
7	A First one being Telecellular, Inc.
8	Q Okay.
9	A And we're going to ignore that
10	first joint venture because it involved me.
11	And I had an agreement with Mr. Nemath and Mr.
12	Conrad as to who was going to own what in the
13	various licensed corporations, and I was
14	supposed to own one of them. Mr. Nemath had
15	conveniently forgot this.
16	So in May 1995, after Telecellular
17	Puerto Rico, Inc. has been formed, and after
18	Telecellular, the joint venture at the time,
19	the only joint venture that existed, following
20	an extended implementation authority request
21	for the Federal Communications Commission

How many licenses were involved at

Q

1 that point? 2 Α Oh, man! About thirty. 3 0 All in Puerto Rico? 4 Α Yes. 5 Okay. Go on. I'm sorry. Q 6 Filed implementation Α same 7 authority request. Nemath had hired Richard 8 Myers's law firm here now, and they file an 9 EIA for the joint venture. But the way it 10 works of course is each--what's going to get 11 the extent implementation authority is not 12 Telecellular joint venture. It's going to be 13 the call signs that were part and party to it 14 of course, which are owned by the various 15 licensed corporations who were clients of 16 Express. 17 So the EIA got filed in May '94, 18 was granted in February '95, about the time 19 that Telecellular Puerto Rico got formed in 20 Delaware. The second company. In May '95 21 they have a meeting, and Conrad and Nemath

convince all the directors of all the licensed

corporations to sign a second set of documents 1 that conflict with the first set of documents. 2 3 That we're going to pretend like--they pretend like the first set of documents doesn't exist. 4 So that's the situation when I'm 5 6 released from Leavenworth prison camp, and I call up Mr. Conrad. Says okay, I tell you 7 what we're going to do, Paul. I'm going to 8 9 forgive you for trying to cheat me, and if 10 you--are you going to be willing to work with 11 me? He says yes -- yes. I was bad. I did bad. He got paid \$100,000 and he already spent the 12 13 money, so he was--Who'd he get paid by? 14 0 By who? 15 Α Mr. Nemath for--To form the second corporation? 16 17 Yes. That was his--that was sort Α of the price that Ed, Ed and--Roger--that was 18 the time Roger Crane and David Baird, a number 19 20 of other people, they paid Paul to do this. So Paul was not exactly blameless. So Paul 21 22 decides he's going to work with Telecellular,

Inc. and me, and so we start sending out 1 2 letters and sending out agreements for people 3 to sign, and trying to recover the situation. Mr. Nemath decides that his best 4 5 defense is to contact my U.S. probation 6 officer and put me back in prison, which is what he tries to do for the next several 7 8 years. His defense against what? 9 10 My pointing out that perhaps Mr. Α 11 Nemath and Mr. Crane and Mr. Baird were 12 committing fraud, and the people in Puerto 13 Rico had agreements with Telecellular, Inc. in 14 the first place, and in April 1996 15 Telecellular, Inc. and the licensed 16 corporations filed a law suit in Puerto Rico 17 against Telecellular Puerto Rico, Inc. and Mr. 18 Nemath and Mr. Crane and so forth. And that was orchestrated by you? 19 0 20 Oh, absolutely. Yes, sir. Α 21 Okay. Go on. I'm sorry. 0 22 Quite all right. I'm not allowed Α

1	to go down to Puerto Rico and participate in
2	litigation. I'm not allowed to do anything by
3	my U.S. probation officer or by the judge, the
4	same judge who sentenced me back in January
5	1995. So we run out of money, eventually.
6	The litigation goes on for years. It goes up
7	to the Puerto Rico Supreme Court, at least
8	once or maybe twice. They get the Federal
9	Communications Commission involved, which ends
10	up transferring the licenses of three of the
11	licensed corporations to Telecellular Puerto
12	Rico, Inc., pursuant to a court order from a
13	judge who never saw me. I never participate
14	in litigation.
15	This went on for years and years
16	and years.
17	Q This is in 1996?
18	A 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999.
19	Q And do you know what the action
20	was that the court even requested or initiated
21	with the FCC to begin a license transfer?

The court came out with an order

Α